

bill is going to be. Maybe it will shield their bill from criticism in the short term, but make no mistake, there will be a reckoning if this bill is passed.

Passing a bill of this scale, with so many consequences for the American people, without telling them what is in it, without telling them how they would fare, the political retribution will be swift. It will be a catastrophe for the Republican Party. I am afraid, worse, this bill will be a catastrophe for the American people.

I yield the floor.

#### RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

#### CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

Under the previous order, the Senator from Kentucky or his designee will be recognized.

The Senator from Kentucky.

#### MOTION TO DISCHARGE—S.J. RES. 42

Mr. PAUL. Mr. President, pursuant to the Arms Export Control Act of 1976, I move to discharge the Foreign Relations Committee from further consideration of S.J. Res. 42, relating to the disapproval of the proposed foreign military sale to the Government of Saudi Arabia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the time until 12:30 p.m. will be equally divided between the proponents and opponents of the motion to discharge.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. President, today is an extraordinary day. Today is an auspicious day, for we will be discussing issues of war and peace.

Believe it or not, we rarely discuss such important issues. We have been at war for 15 years. There have been a handful of debates—most of them indirect, most of them forced only under duress, and most of them would have been avoided if the leadership of both parties could avoid them, but today they cannot avoid this debate because this is what is called a privileged motion.

Today we will discuss the involvement of the United States in the Middle East, and we will also discuss whether we should engage in a new war in Yemen. Today we will discuss an arms sale to Saudi Arabia that threatens the lives of millions of Yemenis, but we will discuss something even more important than an arms sale, we will discuss whether we should be actively involved. Should the United States be actively involved with refueling the Saudi planes, with picking targets, with having advisers on the ground? Should we be at war in Yemen?

If you remember your Constitution, it says no President has that authority—only to repel imminent attack—but no President alone has the unilateral authority to take us to war. Yet here we are on the verge of war.

What will war mean for Yemen? Seventeen million folks in Yemen live on the brink of starvation. I think to myself, is there ever anything important that can happen in Washington? Is there anything I can do to save some of the millions of children who are dying in Yemen? This is it. This is this debate today.

It isn't about an arms sale, it is about children like Ali, who died. Why are they dying? Because the Soviets have blockaded the ports. Ninety percent of Yemen's food comes in from the ocean and they can get no food and they are starving and dying of cholera because of war. We think of famine being related to the weather. Sometimes it is, but more often than not famine is related to man, is manmade, and the most common cause is war.

How bad is it in Yemen? Seventeen million people live on the edge of starvation. Some, like Ali, have already died. What are people saying about it? They say that the humanitarian crisis in Yemen may be worse than Syria.

Let me repeat that because nobody in America is listening to this. Everybody is paying attention to some silly show trials and silly stuff going on in committees. Nobody is talking about this at all. They say it is worse than Syria. Millions of people have fled Syria. Hundreds of thousands have died, and people are now predicting Yemen may be worse.

One refugee group said this: The impending famine in Yemen may reach Biblical proportions. Think about that. It is astounding what is going on there, and it is being done without your permission but with your weapons.

Today I will force a vote with the help of Senator MURPHY, who has been a prime mover in this, to tell you the truth, and has done a great job in bringing people together, but we will force this vote for these children in Yemen because we have a chance today to stop the carnage. We have a chance to tell Saudi Arabia we have had enough.

The question is, Should we give money or arms to Saudi Arabia at all? What has Saudi Arabia done over the last 30 years? They have been the No. 1 exporter of jihadist philosophy, the No. 1 exporter of let's hate America, let's hate the Judeo-Christian ethic, let's hate the Judeo-Christian tradition. It is coming from Saudi Arabia. They teach it in the schools in our country. They teach it in the schools in Indonesia. They corrupt the religion of Islam throughout the world, and we are going to give them weapons? I think it is a huge, huge mistake.

If you say: Well, I doubt that. There is no way they are that bad. Don't they share intelligence with us? Don't they help us in the war on terror?

Yes, every time they help us, they hurt us twofold worse. I will give you an example directly from Hillary Clinton. When she is writing honestly and not talking to the public, she sends an email to John Podesta. This is one that was leaked through WikiLeaks. Writing to John Podesta, Hillary Clinton said: We must put pressure on Saudi Arabia and Qatar because they are supplying logistical and financial support to ISIL.

ISIS is the group we are fighting in the Middle East again, and Saudi Arabia was supplying them. This is according to Hillary Clinton, not indirectly but directly.

Who in their right mind would give money, arms, or share our technology with a country that has been supporting ISIS? Who would do that? Who would think that is a good idea? Yet they will come here and say that it is about Iran, and we have to combat Iran everywhere.

Guess what. This may make the situation with Iran worse. What do you think Iran thinks when Saudi Arabia gets weapons? They think to themselves, well, if the Saudis are getting more, we need more.

What do you think Israel thinks? If the Saudis get more, we need more.

Have you ever heard of an arms race? That is what this is. We are fueling an arms race in the Middle East. Every side wants more. You say: Well, we have to do this. We have to combat Iran.

Do you know how much the Gulf sheikhdoms, Saudi Arabia, and all their allies—the ones who are bombing the hell out of Yemen—do you know how their military spending compares to that of Iran? It is 8 to 1. All of the money is in the Gulf. All of the power, all of the weapons are in the Gulf sheikhdoms. They have more weapons and spend more on weapons—8 to 1—than Iran.

We are going to vote on Iran sanctions this week, and they say that they don't want ballistic missiles Iran. Well, I don't either. The best way to do that is to put pressure on Saudi Arabia.

How would you put pressure on Saudi Arabia? Maybe we wouldn't sell them arms. Maybe we would withhold the sale of arms until they come to the table and we get a ballistic agreement with Iran. It is a naive and foolish notion to think that Iran is going to give up on their ballistic weapons. They are never giving up on their ballistic weapons unless Saudi Arabia did the same thing.

People don't talk about this, but Saudi Arabia has ballistic missiles. They have Chinese missiles. They are called the Dongfeng-21 N-3. They have dozens of these. Do you know where they are pointed? Tehran and Tel Aviv.

Saudi Arabia is no friend of Israel. Do they cooperate with Israel some? Yes, but their missiles are pointed at Tel Aviv, Israel. Saudi Arabia's other missiles are pointed at Tehran. Are these missiles nuclear capable? Yes.

They are not thought to be nuclear tipped, meaning they haven't been armed with nuclear missiles, but everyone who is in the arms community acknowledges that these missiles could carry a nuclear payload if they were altered. They have the ability to do it.

Should we send arms to Saudi Arabia? Here is another quote from Bob Graham, and this is a paraphrase. He says that there is an abundance of evidence that the Saudis were complicit in 9/11.

Have we forgotten that 15 out of the 19 hijackers were from Saudi Arabia? Have we forgotten the missing 28 pages that they kept from the American public for over a decade? When you read those missing 28 pages, which have now been released, they tend to implicate Saudi Arabia. They tend to indicate that the attackers, particularly in San Diego, were befriended by a government agent for Saudi Arabia.

There is an abundance of information that implicates Saudi Arabia in 9/11. In fact, less than a year ago, this very Congress voted unanimously or virtually unanimously to let American citizens—the victims of 9/11, their families—sue Saudi Arabia. This is an extraordinary thing. We almost never let people sue governments, particularly foreign governments, but we voted nearly unanimously. Why? Because people still have sympathy for the 9/11 victims and their families and because people obviously believe there is some information that may implicate Saudi Arabia.

You say: Oh, no, they have changed. Well, how much could they have changed? It was only a year or two ago Hillary Clinton was writing that email saying that the Saudis are giving financial and logistical support to ISIL. Who in their right mind would sell arms to Saudi Arabia under those circumstances?

If it doesn't persuade you that the Saudis are supporting ISIL and terrorism and may have been part of 9/11, perhaps we should look not only at the humanitarian disaster in Yemen—what they are doing to the public and that their goal basically is famine, to bring them to submission—but perhaps we should also look at Saudi Arabia as a country. Perhaps we should look at the human rights record of Saudi Arabia.

I will give you a couple of instances of what it is like to live in Saudi Arabia. There was a young girl who was 19 years old. They haven't named her because her story is so traumatic. She was 19 years old. They call her the Girl of Qatif. She was 19 years old, and she was raped by 7 men.

The men were punished, a couple of years in prison. You know what happened? They arrested the victim because, you see, in Saudi Arabia it is your fault if you are raped. In Saudi Arabia, rape victims are arrested, put in prison, and publicly whipped. She was given 6 months in prison and 200 lashes. That was her sentence.

Ultimately, it did not come to the fore. Do you know why? Partly because

the United States stood up and said it was wrong and partly because, perhaps behind the scenes, we said: Maybe we are not going to sell you weapons if you behave like a bunch of barbarians.

I will tell you another story about Ali al Nimr, a Shiite. The Middle East is somewhat divided between Sunni and Shia. He is a Shiite. They are about 10 percent of the public in Saudi Arabia. They are the minority. They are treated like dirt. His uncle was a sheikh. And by all accounts, he was one who called for peaceful elections, who wasn't an advocate of violence. He never was known or seen to have a weapon but was executed by the Saudis for leading protests. He was executed for standing up in front of people and saying: We should have elections. We should not have this authoritarian government that lords it over us and does not allow us even to practice our religion in public.

Ali's uncle was beheaded. Ali was 17 at the time. It was the beginning of the Arab Spring, and Ali got excited and motivated. If you see the pictures of him, it is heartbreaking. You see pictures of him in western clothing. He liked poetry. He liked music. He was, by all means, the kind of person that we wish would come to leadership in Saudi Arabia.

At 17, he went to a rally and he chose to be part of the Arab Spring to say: We don't want authoritarianism. We don't want despots. We don't want Kings and all of their lording over us. We want elections.

For that, he was arrested and put on death row. Death row in Saudi Arabia, being Saudi Arabia, includes beheading and crucifixion. That will be his sentence—beheading and crucifixion.

This is the regime that you are being asked to send weapons to. People say: Oh, they are buying them.

The technology is ours. It is American technology that was developed for the defense of this country, and the companies would never have the technology had we not paid them to have it. The American taxpayer has a right to that technology, and while for almost every other good in the marketplace the government has no right to tell you how who to sell it to, arms are different because they are all developed by the U.S. taxpayer.

I do believe there should be rules about who gets our arms. I don't think we should sell them to Saudi Arabia if they might wind up in the hands of ISIS. I don't think we should sell them to Saudi Arabia if they punish people for protests, if they punish people for speaking out by beheading them and crucifying them.

I am not for selling them a rifle, much less precision-guided missiles. Some will say: Oh if we give them more accurate missiles, they will kill civilians. That presumes they are not targeting civilians.

Do you think it was a mistake? Do you think they accidentally bombed a funeral procession? Do you think their

intelligence was so bad they didn't know it was a funeral procession? They killed 125 people at a funeral. They wounded 500. We wonder about why we have so much terrorism. Yes, maybe some hate us inherently, but some of it is blowback to policy.

Do you think the people who died or the people who survived or the relatives of those who died in that funeral procession will ever forget it? They will remember it 100 years from now.

The problem we face is that terrorism goes on and on as long as we keep supporting despots who treat their people like crap, who sentence them to beheading and crucifixion, who are starving their neighboring country, which is one of the poorest nations on the planet Earth.

We are not getting better. We are not getting any closer to peace by supporting the Saudis. It is a huge mistake. The Girl of Qatif, a rape victim, was sentenced to prison and 70 lashes. Ali al Nimr, still on death row, was sentenced to beheading and crucifixion. Raif Badawi, who is he? I don't know much about him, but he is an outspoken blogger. He is somebody who writes his opinion and may have opinions that may not be orthodox. For that, the Saudis arrested him, and he is in jail for 10 years, and he is sentenced to a thousand lashes.

I don't think you can survive a thousand lashes, so the Saudis—in their great humanity—are dividing his treatment into 10 doses. He has already had 100 publicly applied. He has 900 more to go.

Shouldn't we think a little bit about supplying arms to this country? If the human rights aspect of this is not enough, I think we should probably think about the region. There is a problem in the Middle East. There is conflict. Some of it goes very deep.

Those who live in the Middle East member the Battle of Karbala in 680 A.D., when a grandson of Muhammad and Khalifa came together and had a battle. They still remember, and they are still unhappy about a battle from 680 A.D.; they have long memories.

I am reminded of what one Afghan told a reporter or a soldier recently. He said: You have all the watches, but we have all the time. They live there and have for centuries and will be there when we are gone. They have to fix their own problems. We can occasionally say that we are going to help some people destroy an evil empire or an evil group like ISIS, yes, but the people fighting—the people on the ground—need to be the people who live there. It cannot be foreigners, and it cannot be people whom they consider to be pagans or it is never going to work. Yet we are foolish if we do not look at the repercussions of what it means to sell arms to Saudi Arabia.

How will Iran react?

I was in a committee hearing the other day, and one of the Senators said: We do not care how Iran reacts. We do not care what it thinks.

By golly, we ought to if we are going to put sanctions on them. Doesn't that mean we care enough that we are trying to modulate and change their behavior? The whole idea of sanctions means that we do care about what Iran thinks. It does not mean we agree with it, it does not mean we condone it, and it does not mean we say Iran is right. But, certainly, we do care about what it thinks. What do you think Iran thinks about supplying arms to Saudi Arabia? It thinks: We need more.

Saudi arms alone are the third biggest in the world now. It is the United States, which is as big as the next 10 combined. Then, it is China. Then, it is Saudi Arabia. Saudi Arabia has these other gulf sheikhdoms, despots. They are all allies of ours. There are about five or six of them, and, altogether, they have eight times more weapons than Iran. So we are complaining—I think, justifiably so—because we worry about the mischief of Iran in the Middle East. We are complaining about that, and we want them to change their behavior.

What do you think is the prime reason they create weapons and are creating the ballistic missiles?

Some of it is because they fear our invasion, like in Iraq, but I think a great deal of why Iran develops weapons is its fear of Saudi Arabia. In fact, when you look back at Iraq and the whole weapons of mass destruction that never existed, one of the interesting stories is that—it may be a theory, but I think it has some evidence—Saddam Hussein pretended, valiantly, that he had weapons of mass destruction not to deter us but to deter Iran. Here is Saddam Hussein, sending all of these smoke signals up that he has weapons of mass destruction because he wants to keep Iran at bay.

We think everything is about us, and we never acknowledge that maybe some of it is about the regional politics. When we give weapons or sell weapons to Saudi Arabia, there will be, for every action, a reaction. There will be significantly more pressure for Iran to come forward and have more weapons.

What does it do to our ally Israel?

There have been at least a few reports that say Israel believes that, every time we give a dollar to Saudi Arabia, they need to respond with a dollar and a half. There was a quote from one of their government ministers on this, which reads that he worries about their qualitative edge.

I have a quote here from a colleague of mine—a friend of mine—who is a rabbi and a friend of the Constitution.

Rabbi Nate Segal writes:

While I understand the President's intentions, we must proceed with great caution due to the challenges and the history of the region. At this time, I don't see the benefits of the arms deal for the United States or Israel.

This is coming from someone who believes, with every fiber of his being, that Israel should be defended. He is

worried that, by giving weapons to Saudi Arabia, it detracts from the qualitative edge that Israel currently has.

Imagine what would happen if the Government of Saudi Arabia were overthrown. They have billions and billions of dollars of weapons. Many of these weapons are the most sophisticated weapons we have. Is there a chance that they could be overthrown? I don't know. They behead their citizens and crucify them. Do you think anybody who lives in Saudi Arabia might have some pent-up anger for the regime?

William Wilberforce once said of slavery: "In having heard all this, you can choose to look the other way, but you can never say that you didn't know."

I love that statement because so many people at the time of slavery looked away. They just said: It is something we do. It is part of our time. It is part of our age.

So many people knew the horror of slavery. So many people knew the horror of what was happening to a people, and they looked away.

I think, in having heard of the impending famine in Yemen, in having seen Ali, and in having heard of the impending famine, you can choose to look away. Many in this body will, today, choose to look away.

They will say: Do you know what? Saudi Arabia gives us some benefit sometime, and we hate Iran more. So let's just give some more weapons to Saudi Arabia.

They will be looking away from the human rights tragedy that is central to Saudi Arabia's whole being. They will be looking away from the fact that Saudi Arabia was supporting ISIS in the Syrian civil war. They will be looking away from the fact that the Saudi blockade is starving Yemeni children.

Do you know what? I choose not to look away. Today I stand up for the thousands of civilians who are being killed in Yemen. Today I stand up for the millions of voiceless children in Yemen who will be killed by the Saudi blockade. Today I stand up for saying that we, the United States, should no longer be fueling the arms race in the Middle East. It has come to no good. The wars and the rage and the anger are thousands of years old. We will never get to the bottom of it. We should defend ourselves at all costs. We should be very careful as to whom is admitted into the country, and we should not get involved in every civil war in every misbegotten part of the planet.

It is my hope and my prayer that enough Americans will wake up and say that we are tired of war, that we are tired of funding every war on the globe, and that we are tired of sacrificing our young in every civil war.

Today this will be a bipartisan vote. There will be a large contingent from the other side of the aisle and a small contingent from this side. This is important. This is a rare day in Senate

history, when we actually have the chance to stop an evil, but we will stop this evil by sending a loud message to the President and a loud message to Saudi Arabia that we are not going to blindly support the arms race.

We are not going to be blind to your human rights transgressions, and we are not going to blindly give you weapons in the face of beheading your citizens and crucifying them.

Today I take a stand for those who do not have a voice, and I hope the Senate will think long and hard and will vote against this arms sale to Saudi Arabia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The assistant Democratic leader.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, let me say at the outset that I support the position from the Senator from Kentucky. I believe that what he has said about the situation between the United States and Saudi Arabia is timely and needs to be heard. People across the United States and around the world should be aware of the fact that we are witnessing four famines across this world. One of them is in Yemen, and three others are on the continent of Africa. This is a famine that is created not by drought, not by national defense, but by human disaster—by a war that has been created and is one that has been pushed largely by the Saudis at the expense of the people—the innocent people—who live in the country of Yemen.

What the Senator from Kentucky is basically calling on all of us to do is to ask: What role is the United States playing in Saudi Arabia's aggressive activities? Should we be more vigilant in our knowing that what we are selling them is being used in ways that are inconsistent with the values of the United States of America? We know the record of the Saudi monarchy when it comes to human rights, and the Senator from Kentucky has spoken to that quite eloquently. We know what they have done to their own people, to the people who live in their country, and to those who seek to have the basic freedoms that we take for granted in America.

We also know that, when it comes to the Saudi activity of promoting their version—the most extreme version—of Islam, they have been guilty of promulgating Wahhabism, which has led to extreme forms of the Muslim faith in some places in the world. Those are realities.

We know the reality of 9/11. When we traced the origins of those who came and killed 3,000 innocent Americans, too many roads led back to Riyadh; too many roads led back to Saudi Arabia. So why can't we be more open and honest in our relationship with this country?

The Senator from Kentucky has told us this morning that the amendment that will be offered shortly by him and by Senator MURPHY is one that calls on the Senate to take an honest look at Saudi Arabia today and its relationship with the United States.

May I add one other element on a personal basis?

It is so rare on the floor of the Senate to see what we have just seen this morning—a proposal for an amendment to be debated and an amendment to be voted on on the floor of the Senate. I can count on one hand how many times that has happened this year in the Senate. What used to be the most deliberative body in America—the great debating society and so forth—has turned into a place of rubberstamps and unanimous consents. I am glad—win or lose in our effort here on this amendment—that the Senator is bringing this important issue to the floor. I thank him for making it a bipartisan effort in the process.

#### HEALTHCARE LEGISLATION

Mr. President, what I have come to the floor to speak to is another issue that really calls on the Senate and asks the basic question: Why are we here?

I think we know that we were elected to make America a better nation and to help families across this Nation realize the great opportunity and goodness of this Nation.

One of the issues that most people worry about the most in their daily lives is healthcare. They should. Many times, I have said on the floor that, if you have ever been in a position in your life as a father of a seriously sick child and have had no health insurance when that has happened, you will never forget that as long as you live. I know. I have been there. I went through a period of time with my wife, in raising our daughter, when she needed the best medical care in America, and we did not have any health insurance. It was frightening to think what would happen to our little girl because we did not have the protection of health insurance and the quality care that everybody wants for themselves and for the people they love.

At this moment in time, we are in a debate about the future of healthcare in America—the future of health insurance in America. I cannot think of a more serious topic. People say: Well, it is one-sixth of the American economy—our healthcare system. That is critically important. Even more so, this is such a personal matter for every individual.

The Affordable Care Act, which was passed 6 or 7 years ago, I was proud to vote for. We couldn't get any support from the other side of the aisle—not one single vote, not one Republican vote in support of it. Our goal, of course, with the Affordable Care Act was to reduce the number of Americans who were uninsured when it came to health insurance. We achieved a major part of our goal. The rate of uninsured in health insurance in America was cut in half by the Affordable Care Act. We expanded opportunities for health insurance through the Medicaid Program, as well as through private insurance exchanges, which were moved in the right direction.

We also said something else in that we wanted to build into the health insurance system of America protections for families. We wanted to make sure that you could not be discriminated against in buying health insurance simply because someone in your family had been sick. Think of how many of us—one out of three, I might add—have preexisting conditions or of someone in our family who has a preexisting condition. It happens—a child surviving cancer, a child with diabetes, somebody in the family who has a heart condition. Those are the realities of life for families across America.

Before the passage of the Affordable Care Act, the health insurance companies could say not only no to you but, really, no when it came to coverage, or they could charge you premiums that were way beyond what people could afford to pay. We eliminated that in the Affordable Care Act—eliminated it. You cannot discriminate against an American on the basis of his having a preexisting medical condition.

The insurance companies went wild in defining what a preexisting condition was that might raise your premiums or to deny you coverage. Having had acne in your adolescence was a preexisting condition. The fact that you were a woman who might give birth to a child was a preexisting condition. The list went on and on. We eliminated that and said that you cannot discriminate against Americans because of those things.

We have people on the other side who have said that we have to get rid of that protection. If we do, what will happen to all of these people?

On Saturday, I went to a march in Chicago, in Lincoln Park. It was the Children's Heart Foundation and the congenital heart defect alliance. Of course, it speaks for itself. The No. 1 birth defect among children in America is a heart defect, and 1 out of 100 babies born has a heart problem. These are kids with preexisting conditions. You should have seen the families show up in big, big numbers, supporting little kids—some of them just babies. They were proudly wearing T-shirts, standing up, and saying that we are going to fight for this little boy or little girl. They were trying to promote medical research to save their lives.

It is something that really touched me as I looked at 600 people on that hot Saturday afternoon, marching in Lincoln Park in Chicago. I said to them: When it gets down to the basics in life, the most important thing in your life is your baby. The next most important thing is your family, whom you have standing behind that baby. Then there is the doctor—that doctor whom you are counting on to do everything in his power or her power to make sure your baby survives. But you need to bring into this conversation another group—politicians, Senators, and Congressmen—because we are making decisions right here in Washington that will decide whether the families who marched

in Lincoln Park in Chicago on Saturday and families like them all across America will have access to affordable health insurance, real health insurance that will cover them. That is what the debate is about.

It was just a few weeks ago that the House of Representatives passed a measure to repeal the Affordable Care Act and to replace it. At the end of the day, not a single Democrat voted for the measure. It passed by two votes—two votes—in the House of Representatives.

When they came back and analyzed what the Republicans had voted for in the House of Representatives when it came to healthcare, here is what they found: Their proposal to eliminate the Affordable Care Act—the one that passed the House of Representatives several weeks ago—according to the Congressional Budget Office—a non-partisan, expert group—according to the CBO, 23 million Americans will lose their health insurance under the plan that passed the House of Representatives. In my State of Illinois, with 12.5 million people in our population, 1 million people would lose their health insurance.

I will just tell my colleagues, I don't see how any Member of Congress can stand before us and say: I have a great solution for healthcare in America. We are going to take health insurance away from 23 million people. But that is what the vote did. And their vote, sadly, eliminated the protection against discrimination because of preexisting conditions.

So what has been the reaction to the House repeal bill that was passed? I can tell my colleagues that in my State there is not a single group, not one medical advocacy group, who supports what the House of Representatives did.

I am from downstate Illinois, outside the city of Chicago. I have a congressional district down there in smalltown America, great people. If you went into that part of Illinois and said to them "I am going to vote for a measure that is going to put in jeopardy the future of your local hospital," the people would literally rise up to resist it.

The Illinois Hospital Association tells us that the Affordable Care Act repeal passed by the House of Representatives endangers hospital services all across our State but especially in small towns and in rural America. They estimate that we are going to lose 60,000 jobs at these hospitals in our State. I can tell you what those hospital jobs are in smalltown America, in rural America. They are the best jobs in the community. These are medical experts, doctors and nurses and supervisors and administrators who keep these hospitals operating, and they are paid well to do it, and they should be. Those are the jobs at risk of being eliminated by the vote in the House of Representatives.

One million people in our State could lose health insurance, and our hospitals are threatened with closure.

That is why the Illinois Hospital Association opposes what the Republicans did in the House of Representatives, and that is why the Illinois State Medical Society—our doctors—and the Chicago Medical Society have come out against what happened in the House of Representatives. That is why the nurses have opposed what was passed in the House of Representatives as well. Not a single medical advocacy group supports what happened in the House of Representatives. Not one in my State. Can't find one of them.

So now we remember from basic civics that after it passes the House, it is our turn in the Senate. What are we going to do with healthcare reform? Well, I wish I could tell you. We are told we are going to vote on it. Maybe as soon as 2 weeks from now, we will come to the floor and vote on changing the healthcare system of the United States of America.

What is the proposal of the Republicans in the Senate when it comes to the future of our healthcare system in America? I don't know, and the reason I don't know is it is being done in secret. There have been no committee hearings, no opportunity to offer amendments. In fact, we haven't even seen the measure we are going to be asked to vote on in 2 weeks.

The Congressional Budget Office, which is supposed to analyze it, hasn't published any analysis of the Republican plan. Yet they are moving forward at a breakneck pace to have us vote on it, up or down, before we leave for the Fourth of July recess. It is a frightening prospect.

They will do it under what is known as reconciliation. I won't bore people with Senate procedure, but what it basically means is they can move it through with a simple majority vote in the U.S. Senate. Amendments will be considered on what they call a vote-arama basis. And if it sounds like some kind of a game, it is almost a game. You offer an amendment and you get perhaps 1 minute to explain your amendment on changing healthcare in America, and the other side gets 1 minute to explain their opposition, and off you go to a vote and then another one and another one. Your head is spinning, trying to figure out what in the world each of these amendments and each of these votes is going to mean. Those are the measures to be taken by the Senate when it comes to healthcare.

This is exactly the opposite of what happened when the Affordable Care Act was passed. We adopted 160 Republican amendments to the Affordable Care Act. None of them voted for final passage, but 160 amendments were offered by Republicans to change it, and they were adopted. It was a bipartisan process on the amendments.

How many amendments will we be able to offer to the Republican Senate proposal that is going to come before us in 2 weeks? The answer is that we don't know because we have never seen

the Republican proposal. It has been done in secret. Thirteen Republican Senators were chosen by the majority leader to sit in private and come up with this bill. There was no open committee hearing, no open discussion. Some Republicans were invited in, and some were not. We don't know what the ultimate product will look like, but I can tell you this: Whatever the Republican Senators come up with, it is going to have a dramatic impact on each and every single American, every one of us in our communities back home.

I know this idea of repealing the Affordable Care Act in 2 weeks is a solemn political promise that many Republicans made, but they also made a promise to the people they represent to do what they can to help these families through their difficult times. That is why we need to make sure the product that is passed by the Republicans in the Senate is one that serves the needs of people across the United States of America.

If this product coming from the Republicans is like the House measure that takes away health insurance for 23 million Americans, then I can understand why the Republicans want to do this in secret. I can understand why they don't want us to see it until the very last minute and then vote on it and get out of town as fast as they can, because it is an embarrassment to think that the U.S. Senate and the House, for that matter, would vote to take away health insurance from 23 million Americans. That is a dereliction of duty, and from where I am sitting, it is just flat immoral to take away health insurance from that many people.

What if we end up with a product like the House of Representatives' that jeopardizes rural hospitals and hospitals in the inner cities, that closes down these community healthcare clinics, reduces access. Well, I will tell you what will happen. People without health insurance will still show up at the hospital sick, in the emergency room, and they will still be treated, but they won't be able to pay for it. Who will pay for their care? We will pay for their care. Everyone else with health insurance will pay more because people who are uninsured will receive free medical care. That is the reality. And, of course, if you don't have a regular doctor or a regular medical home, as they call it these days, what started off as a minor problem could turn into a major problem, even life-threatening. That is why the Affordable Care Act builds into it community healthcare clinics and opportunities to create a medical home.

When I met with the Chicago Medical Society at a convention they had in Chicago this last week, I was surprised by a few things. First, I was surprised to learn that out of the 5,000 physicians in the Chicago Medical Society, they received responses back from over 1,000 who said they thought the measure

that passed the House of Representatives—the Republican repeal bill—was the worst news they had heard when it came to the future of healthcare. They preferred the Affordable Care Act. But they went on to say something that may surprise people. These doctors—over 1,000 of them responding to the survey—said they thought it was time for us to talk about very significant changes to our healthcare system in America. They are tired of fighting the private insurance companies. What they suggested is that we look at a plan like Medicare for all.

Right now, Medicare serves 50 million or 60 million Americans. People can't wait to turn 65 and finally qualify for Medicare, with no exclusions for preexisting conditions, and they know that Medicare is going to give them quality care, and it is not going to bankrupt them as individuals.

These doctors in the Chicago area have said it is now time for America to seriously look at Medicare for all, and I agree with them. I think it is time to look at it because the private health insurance system, even as we have tried to save it, salvage it, remake it through the Affordable Care Act, has real shortcomings.

I hope those on the other side who are considering changes in our healthcare system will actually listen to doctors, listen to hospital administrators, and listen to the families they represent. Why they are doing this in secrecy, why they are refusing to give us a chance for committee hearings and amendments I can't tell you, other than the obvious: Clearly, what they have come up with is something they don't believe the American people will accept, so they need to push it through without disclosure at the last minute and get out of town in the hopes that people won't blame them.

Well, when it comes to healthcare, people don't forget. I won't forget, and the people of Illinois won't forget the votes that were cast in the House of Representatives which threaten to take away health insurance from 1 million people in my State.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FLAKE). The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished senior Senator from Illinois for his comments. Certainly we hear those same things in town meetings in Vermont.

#### RUSSIA INVESTIGATION

Mr. President, on another matter, this afternoon, Attorney General Sessions will return to the Senate for the first time since his confirmation hearing. It has been more than 3 months since the press revealed that the Attorney General gave false testimony in response to questions from both myself and from Senator FRANKEN about his contact with Russian officials; yet the Attorney General has made no effort to come back before the Judiciary Committee to explain these actions—actions that some could construe as perjury.

There are now countless new and troubling questions swirling around the Attorney General. In fact, he was scheduled to appear before the Appropriations Committee this morning—a committee that would have to vote on his request for a budget—but, for the second time in as many months, he abruptly canceled. Neither I nor Senator FRANKEN sit on the Intelligence Committee, so we are not going to have the opportunity to follow up with the Attorney General in person. I am not going to be able to ask him why he hid his contacts with the Russian Ambassador, including a reported third meeting at the Mayflower Hotel, nor will I be able to ask about the timing of his recusal or his involvement with the Russia investigation both before his recusal and after. I will not be able to ask whether the President ever suggested he intervene in the Russia investigation in any way. And especially I will not be able to ask how the Attorney General can justify violating his recusal from the Russia investigation by working to fire its lead investigator.

The American people deserve answers to each of these questions—not only answers, they deserve truthful answers. That is why I shared my questions for Attorney General Sessions on these topics. But I also shared them with members of the Intelligence Committee.

So, at least, on the plus side, Attorney General Sessions will finally face some serious questions, but I am still concerned he is not going to be the most forthcoming witness. We saw last week that Trump administration officials have invented a brand new claim of privilege to insulate themselves from congressional oversight—and to protect themselves from giving answers that would be embarrassing or damaging to the President.

I asked the Congressional Research Service to provide me with a list of valid reasons to refuse to answer a question from a Senator. There is executive privilege, of course, but it has to be invoked by the President, and it is not absolute. Of course, there are also constitutional privileges, such as the Fifth Amendment right to not incriminate oneself. Even in my days as prosecutor, I strongly protected the rights of people, no matter what crime they were charged with, to take the Fifth Amendment if they wanted to, but there is no “I would rather not answer” privilege. That is not in the Fifth Amendment. That is not an executive privilege. Unless it necessarily involves disclosing classified information, the answer “I would rather discuss this behind closed doors” is not a valid response either. That is really not a valid response. That is just trying to get out of answering questions.

The Attorney General’s spokesperson said yesterday that Attorney General Sessions “believes it is important for the American people to hear the truth directly from him and [he] looks forward to answering the committee’s

questions.” Yet it was also reported yesterday he plans to invoke executive privilege in response to some inquiries. If true, the Attorney General is speaking out of both sides of his mouth.

I hope the Attorney General is not going to allow President Trump to follow the precedent of Richard Nixon and go down the path of invoking executive privilege to stop an inquiry into illegal or unethical conduct. These questions need to be answered. The American people deserve the truth. They deserve an Attorney General who is held accountable for his leadership of the Justice Department, not one who is embroiled in controversy and hides from the congressional committee of oversight jurisdiction of his Department.

We must not lose sight of the fact that our democracy was attacked. It was attacked by a country that has no respect for us. If we do not take this seriously, we will be attacked again. We must know exactly how that happened so we can protect our democratic institutions and protect our country. This goes way beyond the Republican or the Democratic parties. That includes knowing whether members of the Trump campaign enabled Russian interference.

Russia is not a friend. Just as they have tried to interfere with elections in some of the NATO countries in other parts of the world, we know they have tried to interfere with ours. The American people also deserve to know whether the President or his administration have attempted to interfere in the Russia investigation, knowing it was improper. Any such attempt would amount to obstruction of justice.

Attorney General Sessions needs to answer critical questions today. He needs to answer for his leadership of the Justice Department in both the Senate Appropriations and the Judiciary Committees. He can keep ducking the questions, but sooner or later, the Attorney General must answer for his actions.

We deserve to know whether he is acting in the public interest—which is what an Attorney General should do—or in Donald Trump’s personal interest. If he cannot decide between those interests, if he cannot distinguish between the public’s interests and Donald Trump’s interests, well, he is not fit to serve as Attorney General.

I pointed out, when Deputy Rosenstein came before the Appropriations Committee this morning, all the things the administration were cutting out of the budget—money for victims of crime, money to go after the opioid epidemic in this country, large cuts in the FBI. I could go on and on. However, there is one place they did put in money for more lawyers. They put in money for lawyers to work taking private property of people in Texas and Arizona and elsewhere to build this wall of the President’s. So we will take out money for victims of crime or for fighting the opioid epidemic, but we will sure learn how to get money to

hire private lawyers to go after people’s private property along the Rio Grande to build a wall which will not really accomplish anything, other than to fulfill part of a campaign promise—a campaign promise to build a \$40 billion wall. The other part, of course, was to have Mexico pay for it. The check is in the mail—very, very, very slow mail.

I see—speaking of Attorneys General and people from Texas—my friend, the former attorney general of Texas, the distinguished senior Senator from Texas on the floor so I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Republican whip.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I thank the senior Senator from Vermont for his kind words. We do agree, occasionally, about a few things. We are, in some ways I think, the odd couple when it comes to things like open government and freedom of information. We agree on those things, somebody, I would say, from the left end of the political spectrum and somebody like me from the right end of the political spectrum, which I find particularly gratifying, but there are a lot of other things we have different views on. That is not unusual or to be unexpected, but I enjoy working with him when we can find those areas of common ground to work on.

#### IRAN SANCTIONS BILL

Mr. President, last night, the Senate voted to move forward with tough, new sanctions to hold Iran accountable for its continued support of terrorism. The unanimous vote we had is a strong message to the world that the United States will not tolerate Iran’s complicity on terror and a clear indicator of just how important this legislation is.

Just last month, Secretary of State Tillerson noted that “Iran remains a leading state sponsor of terror.” I would amend that slightly and say it is “the” leading state sponsor of terror.

The Secretary said he would be undertaking a review of the success or failure of the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action—what we know as the lopsided nuclear deal President Obama inked with Iran—because, unfortunately, as we have seen, the Obama administration’s deal, relative to Iran’s nuclear aspirations, did zero—zero—to stop Iran’s investment in terrorism around the world. As a matter of fact, it generated quite a bit of new cash which Iran could use to pay for acts of terrorism around the world. So the JCPOA, the Iran nuclear deal, all but cemented the status of the state sponsor of terrorism as a future nuclear power.

I remember being in the House Chamber when Prime Minister Netanyahu of Israel talked about this paving the way to Iran achieving a nuclear weapon, albeit some 10 years hence, which may seem like a long time to us, but if you are the nation of Israel, 10 years is right around the corner if you are living in that neighborhood and going to be in its crosshairs.

Part of the JCPOA, the Iran nuclear deal, released billions of dollars to the Iranian regime and empowered our adversary—our avowed enemy—to engage in even more terrorist activities abroad. Instead of weakening Iran, it actually bolstered Tehran's hostile capabilities. On top of that, President Obama pushed aside our strongest ally in the region—I mentioned Israel—in order to lay a gift at the feet of one of greatest antagonists of the United States, with little or no benefit to our Nation. That is why it is no surprise Iran continues to violate international restrictions against ballistic missile testing and illicit arms transfers, flying in the face of any promises that were made in the agreement.

Last year, then-Director of National Intelligence James Clapper testified before the Senate Armed Services Committee, confirming what we had all feared: “Iran’s ballistic missiles are inherently capable of delivering [weapons of mass destruction], and Tehran already has the largest inventory of ballistic missiles in the Middle East.”

Under President Obama’s nuclear deal, their conventional inventory and capability are essentially free to grow, and grow they have.

So what kind of deal was the JCPOA, the Iran nuclear deal? It was a lopsided deal. More importantly, it was a dangerous deal as well.

Of course, Iran’s reach goes far beyond their own border. They support the Assad regime in Syria and the Houthi rebellion in Yemen, two groups which have continually encouraged violence against Americans and even murder of their own citizens.

Last month, on his way to Saudi Arabia, Secretary of Defense James Mattis confirmed that Iranian-supplied missiles were being fired by the Houthis into Saudi Arabia. So not only is Iran breaking the nuclear deal but also U.N. Security Council resolutions as well.

In Syria, Iran continues to prop up and shield the Butcher of Damascus, Bashar al-Assad, even after he has brutally used chemical weapons against his own people. Some 400,000 Syrians, at last count, have lost their lives in the Syrian civil war, supported by Iran, supported by Russia, propping up this butcher who is head of the regime.

So last night’s show of bipartisan support is more than just a message of unity against terrorism; it is a sign the Senate will fight to stop Iran from tightening its grip on power. The legislation we will pass this week introduces new sanctions and embargoes on Iran.

First, it imposes new restrictions on persons who transact with and support Iran’s ballistic missile programs, giving our President authority to impose sanctions on their weapons providers.

The legislation also makes clear that the Islamic Revolutionary Guard Corps bears responsibility for destabilizing activities and terrorism in the region by extending new sanctions to them as well.

This bill also addresses Iran’s human rights abuses by directing the Secretary of State to submit a list of people who are guilty of human rights violations so we can take further action against them.

Lastly, it reaffirms the arms embargo by allowing the President to block the property of any person or entity involved in the supply, sale, or transfer of prohibited arms and related materiel to and from Iran.

I also submitted yesterday an amendment to this Iranian sanctions legislation that targets Mahan Air, which is Iran’s largest commercial airline. As a transporter of terrorists and weapons, Mahan Air is nothing more than a commercial coverup for terrorist activities, and, with routes in and out of Europe, it is essential for us to stop their continued expansion and to understand how their activities bear on the safety of American lives.

I am thankful for Chairman CORKER’s leadership on the Iran and now Russia sanctions bill, and the expediency in which we are moving forward. While we can’t, in this bill, undo all of the harm caused by the foreign policy of the Obama administration, we can work to correct course, and I am glad we are doing so in a bipartisan way. Last night’s vote was a sign of unity, and I am looking forward to getting this legislation through the Senate and onto the President’s desk.

Mr. President, I wish to take a moment and talk about the Saudi arms sale, which we will be voting on this afternoon at about 2:30 or in that timeframe. We know Saudi Arabia remains under threat from the violent ambitions of Iran, which I just got through speaking about, but that is not just a threat to us, it is a threat in the region, particularly to Sunni allies like Saudi Arabia.

A stronger Saudi Arabia will provide a powerful deterrent to Iranian aggression. This particular sale of weapons, announced by the President when he was in Saudi Arabia a couple weeks ago, will help provide greater regional stability to pushing back the advancing tide of Iranian-backed terrorism. It will help against Iranian-backed Houthis’ weak government control, which allows terrorism to flourish in the region.

Al-Qaida in the Arabian Peninsula has been described by U.S. officials as the most active and dangerous affiliate of al-Qaida today, with several thousands of adherents and fighters inside of Yemen supported by the Iranian regime. AQAP, al-Qaida in the Arabian Peninsula, has continued to take advantage of the political and security vacuum. This arms sale will also bolster the kingdom’s ability to provide for its own security and continue contributing to counterterrorism operations across the region, thereby reducing the burden on the United States and our own military forces by equipping them to do their own security and not depend on us.

The sale will also help deter regional threats and enhance the kingdom’s ability to protect its borders, contribute to coalition counterterrorism operations, and target bad actors more precisely.

Finally, it will improve the kingdom’s defensive military capabilities. Since 2015, Saudi Arabia has intercepted more than 40 missiles fired at the kingdom by Iranian-backed Houthi militias. Nine of these missiles have struck Saudi territory itself.

I look forward to voting in the 2:30 timeframe this afternoon against the resolution of disapproval filed by our colleague. I think it is important for us to help our allies defend themselves, to fill a power vacuum left that would otherwise be filled by U.S. forces and military effort.

I think it sends a strong message to Iran and their affiliates in the Middle East that we will not stand quietly or stand silently in the face of the continued growth of their terrorist activities and support for terrorist activities around the world.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I come to the Senate floor today to express my support for S.J. Res. 42 and my opposition to the transfer of specific defense articles to the Government of Saudi Arabia. I have arrived at this decision after extensive research and careful deliberation. I would like to state very clearly for the record why I have come to this decision. I have decided to support S.J. Res. 42 and oppose the transfer of specific defense articles to Saudi Arabia primarily because of the Saudi Government’s refusal to take specific steps that I repeatedly requested to alleviate the horrible humanitarian suffering in Yemen.

Before I further explain that decision, I would like to explain what is not informing my decision. I am not reflexively opposed to arms sales in general or to Saudi Arabia specifically. On the contrary, after a series of questions are satisfactorily addressed, I believe arm sales to key partners and allies can enable them to more effectively defend our common interests and oppose common threats. After all, the United States cannot and should not employ U.S. military forces in every instance. When the United States and our partners confront common threats, we should encourage and empower regional allies and regional partners to play prominent roles wherever possible. When our partners are defending our common interests, we want them to be as well-equipped and well-trained and effective as possible.

I recognize that despite our differences, the Saudi Government is an important regional security partner for the United States of America. However, when we work through our allies and partners, we shouldn't set aside our national security interests, and we certainly shouldn't set aside our support for universal humanitarian principles. That principle certainly applies to the Saudis and to the situation in Yemen.

My decision today is based neither on an opposition to arms sales in general nor an opposition to arms sales to the Saudis in particular. Instead, my decision today is based primarily on the persistent and misguided refusal of the Saudi Government to take specific steps that I have requested to alleviate some of the humanitarian suffering in Yemen.

My decision should come as a surprise to no one. As I have said on the Senate floor before, the United Nations calls the situation in Yemen the largest humanitarian crisis in the world. According to the U.N.—which, incidentally, our intelligence resources rely on for much of their information—Yemen has almost 19 million people. Two-thirds of the population is in need of humanitarian or protection assistance, including approximately 10 million who require immediate assistance to save or sustain their lives—two-thirds of their population. If that is not a recipe for instability in a dangerous region of the world, I don't know what is. So 17 million people are food-insecure, while 7 million people don't know where their next meal is coming from, and they are at risk of famine.

In addition, according to the U.N. as of yesterday, the World Health Organization reports a cumulative total of over 124,000 suspected cases of cholera and over 900 associated deaths. Cholera is impacting the most vulnerable. In fact, children under the age of 15 account for 28 percent of all deaths.

The situation is growing far worse. An NGO with personnel on the ground in Yemen tells my office that the large majority of these cholera cases have taken place since late April. Perhaps the most heartbreaking statistic is that a child under the age of 5 dies of preventable causes every 10 minutes in Yemen.

Throughout this process, rather than just mourning this terrible situation, I have tried to identify tangible steps that can save lives, that can lead to a political settlement in Yemen, and that can enhance both regional and national security interests of the United States. In the case of Yemen, it became clear quickly that there were specific steps the Saudis could take to help alleviate the horrible humanitarian situation in Yemen.

Based on that realization back in April—April 27, I led a nine-member, bipartisan letter to the incoming Saudi Ambassador, noting the important security partnership between the United States and the Government of Saudi

Arabia and Saudi Arabia's role as a regional leader. I asked Riyadh to take some specific steps related to Yemen that would prevent thousands or even millions of additional people from dying there. Among several requests, I asked the Saudis to permit the delivery of U.S.-funded cranes to the Port of Hodeidah that would dramatically improve the ability to offload humanitarian supplies there. That is important because the Port of Hodeidah processes roughly 70 to 80 percent of all of the food and other critical imports that come into the country of Yemen. This is the port that supplies people who are in the most desperate need of food and medical attention.

I also asked Riyadh to address unnecessary additional delays that the Saudi-led coalition was causing for humanitarian and commercial supplies going into that port. Not receiving a satisfactory response, I subsequently raised these issues directly with the Saudi Foreign Minister when he met with me and other Senators here on Capitol Hill. Still not receiving a satisfactory answer, we have continued to raise these requests repeatedly with the Saudi Embassy. As recently as yesterday, the Saudis have refused to be responsive on the cranes. Further, in the face of clear evidence from the United Nations to the contrary, the Saudis have even denied a role in causing delays of humanitarian and commercial shipments into Yemen. So for almost 2 months, the Saudis have failed to take my requests seriously.

For those who are new to this issue, perhaps this discussion of cranes and delays at ports seems a bit wonkish—maybe in the weeds. Yet in a humanitarian situation as dire as Yemen—with a child under 5 dying of preventable diseases every 10 minutes—every shipment of food or fuel, every day of delay can have life-and-death implications. The Saudis know this, yet they have been unresponsive to my requests.

There is no doubt that the Iranians and the Houthis are up to no good in Yemen. There is no doubt that Saudi Arabia has the right to defend its borders, and there is also no doubt that this situation in Yemen is complex. But it is a false choice to suggest that we have to choose between opposing Iran and helping the millions of suffering people in Yemen. I believe we have a moral responsibility and a national security imperative to do all we can to help the people in Yemen who are starving, who need medicine, who are dying.

The longer this war in Yemen continues, the more we will drive the Houthis into the arms of the Iranians. The more leverage the Iranians and the Russians will gain in Yemen, the more terrorist groups like al-Qaida in the Arabian Peninsula will thrive.

Perhaps the Saudi Government isn't concerned about my vote. Perhaps they think this issue will just blow over, that attention will wane, that Senators will lose interest. I recognize I am just

one Senator with just one vote, but I would caution the Saudi Government against such a view. I am not going to be losing interest in this issue anytime soon.

To the Saudis I say this: When I make a request and your government is unresponsive—at least as far as I am concerned—there will be consequences for that decision. My vote demonstrates that fact.

To my colleagues, I respectfully say that America's support should never be unconditional. It is in our interests and it is consistent with the humanitarian values that we profess to demand that the Saudis take some of these steps to alleviate humanitarian suffering in Yemen. For this reason, I am going to vote in support of S.J. Res. 42 today, and I urge my colleagues, Republican and Democrat, to do the same.

Thank you, Mr. President.

I yield the floor.

**THE PRESIDING OFFICER.** The Senator from Vermont.

**MR. SANDERS.** Mr. President, I rise to speak in support of the Murphy-Paul-Franken resolution of disapproval and to outline my concerns about the unfettered sale of arms to Saudi Arabia. The Saudi-led war in Yemen has created a humanitarian disaster in one of the region's poorest countries. Many thousands of civilians have been killed, many more made homeless, and millions are at risk of starvation, according to the United Nations refugee agency. The chaos in Yemen has also been strategically disastrous for the United States, providing fertile ground for extremist groups like al-Qaida and ISIS and creating new opportunities for Iranian intervention.

In addition to being morally indefensible and strategically shortsighted, the Trump administration's unconditional support for the Saudi coalition, including billions of dollars in arms sales, risks dragging the United States into yet another war in the Middle East.

These are the reasons I strongly support the resolution of disapproval offered by my colleagues and their effort to block some of these arms sales to Saudi Arabia.

I also think it is long past time that we begin to take a very hard look at our relationship with Saudi Arabia. This is a country that is run by a hereditary monarchy in which women are treated as third-class citizens.

I would like to mention for a moment the case of Loujain Alhathloul, a Saudi Arabian human rights activist who was arrested at King Fahd International Airport on June 4. She has been an advocate for women's rights in Saudi Arabia.

In 2014, she was arrested for defying the country's ban—are you ready for this—on women drivers and imprisoned for 73 days.

In 2015, she ran as a candidate in a local council election—the third in the nation's modern history and the first in which women were allowed to both

vote and run—even though her name was never added to the ballot.

More recently, Alhathloul criticized a Saudi Government-sponsored women's empowerment summit, which was attended by Ivanka Trump, for its lack of inclusiveness.

While she has now been released from jail—and I am very glad to hear that—this is no way to treat a peaceful dissident. The human rights organization Amnesty International reported that during her detention, Alhathloul was not allowed access to an attorney, nor was allowed to speak to her family.

Finally and perhaps more significantly, it is important that here on the floor of the Senate, we begin to discuss the decades-long effort by Saudi Arabia to export an ultra-reactionary form of Islam throughout the world.

A recent piece in the *Boston Globe* by Stephen Kinzer, a journalist who has covered the Middle East for many years—Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have his article printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the *Boston Globe*, June 11, 2017]

SAUDI ARABIA IS DESTABILIZING THE WORLD  
(By Stephen Kinzer)

Just a few months ago, the governor of Indonesia's largest city, Jakarta, seemed headed for easy reelection despite the fact that he is a Christian in a mostly Muslim country. Suddenly everything went violently wrong. Using the pretext of an offhand remark the governor made about the Koran, masses of enraged Muslims took to the streets to denounce him. In short order he lost the election, was arrested, charged with blasphemy, and sentenced to two years in prison.

This episode is especially alarming because Indonesia, the world's largest Muslim country, has long been one of its most tolerant. Indonesian Islam, like most belief systems on that vast archipelago, is syncretic, gentle, and open-minded. The stunning fall of Jakarta's governor reflects the opposite: intolerance, sectarian hatred, and contempt for democracy. Fundamentalism is surging in Indonesia. This did not happen naturally.

Saudi Arabia has been working for decades to pull Indonesia away from moderate Islam and toward the austere Wahhabi form that is state religion in Saudi Arabia. The Saudis' campaign has been patient, multi-faceted, and lavishly financed. It mirrors others they have waged in Muslim countries across Asia and Africa.

Successive American presidents have assured us that Saudi Arabia is our friend and wishes us well. Yet we know that Osama bin Laden and most of his 9/11 hijackers were Saudis, and that, as Secretary of State Hillary Clinton wrote in a diplomatic cable eight years ago, "Donors in Saudi Arabia constitute the most significant source of funding to Sunni terrorist groups worldwide."

Recent events in Indonesia shine a light on a Saudi project that is even more pernicious than financing terrorists. Saudi Arabia has used its wealth, much of which comes from the United States, to turn entire nations into hotbeds of radical Islam. By refusing to protest or even officially acknowledge this far-reaching project, we finance our own assassins—and global terror.

The center of Saudi Arabia's campaign to convert Indonesians to Wahhabi Islam is a

tuition-free university in Jakarta known by the acronym LIPIA. All instruction is in Arabic, given mainly by preachers from Saudi Arabia and nearby countries. Genders are kept apart; strict dress codes are enforced; and music, television, and "loud laughter" are forbidden. Students learn an ultra-conservative form of Islam that favors hand amputation for thieves, stoning for adulterers, and death for gays and blasphemers.

Many of the students come from the more than 100 boarding schools Saudi Arabia supports in Indonesia, or have attended one of the 150 mosques that Saudis have built there. The most promising are given scholarships to study in Saudi Arabia, from which they return fully prepared to wreak social, political, and religious havoc in their homeland. Some promote terror groups like Hamas Indonesia and the Islamic Defenders Front, which did not exist before the Saudis arrived.

Eager to press his advantage, King Salman of Saudi Arabia made a nine-day trip to Indonesia in March, accompanied by an entourage of 1,500. The Saudis agreed to allow more than 200,000 Indonesians to make the hajj pilgrimage to Mecca each year—more than come from any other country—and sought permission to open new branches of their LIPIA university. Some Indonesians are pushing back against the Saudi assault on their traditional values, but it is difficult to deny permission for new religious schools when the state is not able to provide decent secular alternatives. In Indonesia, as in other countries where the Saudis are actively promoting Wahhabism—including Pakistan, Afghanistan, and Bosnia—the weakness and corruption of central governments create pools of rootless unemployed who are easily seduced by the promises of free food and a place in God's army.

The surging fundamentalism that is transforming Indonesia teaches several lessons. First is one that we should already have learned, about the nature of the Saudi government. It is an absolute monarchy supported by one of the world's most reactionary religious sects. It gives clerics large sums to promote their anti-Western, anti-Christian, anti-Semitic brand of religious militancy abroad. In exchange, the clerics refrain from criticizing the Saudi monarchy or its thousands of high-living princes. Saudis with close ties to the ruling family give crucial support to groups like Al Qaeda, the Taliban, and ISIS. This fact should be at the front of our minds whenever we consider our policy toward the Middle East—including when we decide whether to side with the Saudis in their new dispute with neighboring Qatar.

Saudi Arabia's success in reshaping Indonesia shows the importance of the global battle over ideas. Many in Washington consider spending for cultural and other "soft power" projects to be wasteful. The Saudis feel differently. They pour money and resources into promoting their world view. We should do the same.

The third lesson that today's Indonesia teaches is about the vulnerability of democracy. In 1998 Indonesia's repressive military dictatorship gave way to a new system, based on free elections, that promised civil and political rights for all. Radical preachers who would previously have been imprisoned for whipping up religious hatred found themselves free to spread their poison. Democracy enables them to forge giant mobs that demand death for apostates. Their political parties campaign in democratic elections for the right to come to power and crush democracy. This is a sobering reality for those who believe that one political system is best for all countries under all circumstances.

The Saudi campaign to radicalize global Islam also shows that earth-shaking events often happen slowly and quietly. The press, focused intently on reporting today's news, often misses deeper and more important stories. Historians of journalism sometimes point to the northward "great migration" of African-Americans after World War II as an epochal story that few journalists noticed because it was a slow process rather than one-day news event.

The same is true of Saudi Arabia's long campaign to pull the world's 1.8 billion Muslims back to the 7th century. We barely notice it, but every day, from Mumbai to Manchester, we feel its effects.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, this article by Mr. Kinzer used the example—this is just one example—of Indonesia to demonstrate the incredibly negative impact Saudi financing has had in many places around the world.

I will quote from his article:

Saudi Arabia has been working for decades to pull Indonesia away from moderate Islam and toward the austere Wahhabi form that is state religion in Saudi Arabia. The Saudis' campaign has been patient, multi-faceted, and lavishly financed. It mirrors others they have waged in Muslim countries across Asia and Africa.

Successive American presidents have assured us that Saudi Arabia is our friend and wishes us well. Yet we know that Osama bin Laden and most of his 9/11 hijackers were Saudis, and that, as Secretary of State Hillary Clinton wrote in a diplomatic cable eight years ago, "Donors in Saudi Arabia constitute the most significant source of funding to Sunni terrorist groups worldwide."

Recent events in Indonesia shine a light on a Saudi project that is even more pernicious than financing terrorists. Saudi Arabia has used its wealth, much of which comes from the United States, to turn entire nations into hotbeds of radical Islam. By refusing to protest or even officially acknowledge this far-reaching project, we finance our own assassins—and global terror.

That is the end of a quote from that excellent article from the *Boston Globe*.

We all understand that there are times when we must work with problematic governments in order to advance our security goals, but for far too long, we have been giving a pass to a government in Saudi Arabia that supports ideas and policies that are fundamentally at odds with American values and that have led to extremely negative consequences for American security.

I think the time has come for the Congress to take a very hard look at this relationship and assess whether it is actually serving the interests and values of the American people.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. RUBIO). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. President, I take the floor to strenuously argue against

the proposition being pushed by Senators PAUL, MURPHY, and others to deny arms sales of about \$500 million to the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia. The package they are trying to exclude from the \$110 billion arms deal is precision-guided munitions that would be used by the F-15s, a package of Joint Direct Attack Munitions, Paveway laser-guided bombs for Saudi Tornado and Typhoon aircraft. The bottom line is, the package we are talking about are precision weapons the Saudi Air Force and military could use in operations against Iran's proxy in Yemen and other threats that continue to plague us.

The flaws of the Saudi Government are real. They are known to me. My friends on the other side, particularly Senator PAUL, constantly put Saudi Arabia and Iran on the same footing. I think that is a very unwise analysis.

To suggest that Saudi Arabia is as bad as Iran is just missing the point, big time. The Iranian bureaucracy is the most destabilizing force in the Mideast. They have aggressively pursued military action through proxies and have been directly involved in military actions in Syria. Iran's efforts to dominate Iraq, Lebanon, Syria, and now Yemen have to be pushed back.

Here is what Secretary Mattis said about this proposal when I asked him the question: How would Iran view passage of this proposal limiting precision-guided weapons to the Saudis by Congress? He stated: "I believe Iran would be appreciative of us not selling these weapons to Saudi Arabia."

That is pretty direct. Iran would be really happy.

On September 21, 2016, 71 U.S. Senators supported a tank sale to Saudi Arabia. The vote was 71 to 27. In other words, 71 U.S. Senators rejected RAND PAUL's proposal to stop the sale of tanks. I would argue that a tank is not nearly as much of a precision weapon as the weapons we are talking about here to be given to the Saudi Air Force. If we are worried about collateral damage in Yemen, I understand the concern. Precision weapons would help that cause, not hurt it.

We have to understand whom we are dealing with in Yemen. We are dealing with Iran. Saudi Arabia has a border with Yemen. The Iranians are backing a force called the Houthis to bring down a pro-Western government in Yemen. From a Saudi perspective, everywhere you look you see Iran encroaching throughout the Mideast.

The bureaucracy in Iran is the biggest threat to the world order, and that is saying a lot, given the way the world is. I say that with confidence because what Iran is doing is trying to destabilize the Mideast in an unprecedented fashion. Our Arab allies are tired of it, and now is the time to stand with them—with their imperfections—against Iran and their hostilities.

This \$500 million chunk of the \$110 billion weapons sale is absolutely essential to the Saudi Air Force to get

these weapons, not only to minimize casualties but to win the fight against the aggressive nature of Iran in Yemen and other places.

I don't know where we are going with Iran, but the President has said the current nuclear deal is absolutely a terrible deal. He is right. This deal locks in a march toward a nuclear weapon by the Iranians if they don't cheat. They don't have to cheat. In 10 or 15 years, the agreement allows them to enrich and reprocess without limitation, so this deal has to be replaced.

I hope we don't go to war with anyone, but if we go to war, I want allies that are capable to help us in the fight. We complain about our Arab allies not doing enough. When they want to do more, we say no to them. Guess what. No wonder people believe America is an unreliable partner. We say one thing and do another.

To my Democratic colleagues: You were OK with voting to help President Obama increase the capability of the Saudi Army at a time when it was in our national security interest. What has changed between September 21 and today? What geopolitical situation has changed that all of a sudden Iran is no longer the threat they were in September of last year and Saudi Arabia is less reliable? Nothing, other than the election of Donald Trump. I have been a critic of Donald Trump—President Trump—when I thought it was necessary for the good of the country, but all I can say is, this wholesale defection by Democrats really is disturbing. It is undermining, I think, our national security interests when it comes to containing Iran. It is sending the worst possible signal we could be sending to our Arab allies at a time when we need them the most. I don't question people's motives; I question their judgment.

Here is my problem. I had no problem helping President Obama because I believe Saudi is the bulwark against Iranian expansion. Our allies in Saudi Arabia are imperfect, but they do share intelligence with us, they are in the fight, and we need to help them because it is in our interest to help them. You had absolutely no problem helping them when it was President Obama's idea. Everything Trump you seem to be against. That is absolutely disappointing, and quite frankly despicable.

To my Republican colleagues: RAND PAUL has been consistent. I respect his consistency. I just completely disagree with him. If you think containing Iran and keeping them from toppling Yemen, Iraq, Syria, and Lebanon is not in our national interest, you are making a huge mistake. The last thing we want is the Iranian Ayatollah to march through the Mideast and start spreading his form of radical Shi'ism in the backyards of all of our Arab allies.

So I cannot urge this body more to reject this ill-conceived idea. It is \$500 million out of a \$110 billion package. It is the kind of weapons that will matter

on the battlefield. It will lessen civilian casualties, which is a noble goal, and will also give capabilities to the Saudis to more effectively contain Iran that is marching through Yemen, through their proxies, the Houthis.

General Mattis—Secretary Mattis has it right. Iran would be appreciative of our not selling those weapons to Saudi Arabia.

We are going to sanction Iran this week, I hope, for what they have done outside of the nuclear agreement. Since the nuclear agreement was passed, they have humiliated our sailors. They captured them on the high seas and humiliated them. I don't remember Saudi Arabia doing that. They are test-firing missiles in the violation of a U.N. resolution that could destroy Israel and one day reach us and our allies throughout the Mideast and Europe. They are spreading their form of radical Shi'ism all through the world, all through the Mideast. The money they received from the Iranian nuclear deal is not going to build roads, bridges, and hospitals, it is increasing the lethality of the IRG and other Iranian combatant units.

What we are trying to do and what President Trump is trying to do is give our allies the ability to contain the threat which is in our interest. Sanctioning Iran and denying Saudi Arabia the weapons they need to defend themselves and others against Iran is pretty inconsistent.

There is a military necessity for these weapons. It will change the equation on the battlefield. It is in our interest that Iran lose this effort to take over Yemen and destabilize the Mideast at large. You have to remember that these are the same people—the Iranians—who built lethal IEDs and injected them into Iraq—IEDs that killed many, many American soldiers. This is the same regime that took over our Embassy years ago, humiliated our sailors, and chants "death to America and Israel" on a regular basis. Yet here we are, sitting as a legislative body, contemplating our not helping an ally who is willing to fight the threat that is posed by Iran in the Mideast. All I can say is that on September 21, 2016, almost every Democrat saw this as a good move to help Saudi Arabia.

Now almost all of you are voting against an arms package that is more necessary today than it was in 2016. The only change is that we have a new President whom you hate.

I was not a big fan of President Obama's, but when I thought it was right, I stood with him. President Trump is right to increase the capability of the Saudi military to deal with the Iranian aggression. There is no bigger threat to the Middle East and America, I believe, than this Iranian regime in the hands of an ayatollah who is really a religious Nazi.

So I hope you will vote for what is best for America, which is to empower our allies to contain threats that we commonly enjoy. We enjoy the experience of being in the crosshairs of the

Ayatollah. They want to destroy the royal family in Saudi Arabia. They want to destroy Israel, and they want to destroy us. So the idea that we are not going to help an ally that is willing to fight is just inconceivable, and the idea that we are going to vote no for an arms package because Trump is President—and all of you over there voted yes before—is disappointing.

To my Republican colleagues, if you really think Iran is a threat, do not vote with Senator PAUL because you are sending the wrong signal.

I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, while my friend's remarks on the motives of Democrats are fresh in people's minds, let me address this directly. There is a new President today, but there is a different policy, and that is what this resolution is about. Let me be very clear about what we are talking about today.

Senator GRAHAM would have you believe that we are about to vote on the entirety of the \$110 billion in arms sales that was proposed—that was unveiled—by President Trump during his visit to Saudi Arabia. That is not the case. We are voting today on \$500 million of that \$110 billion sale. You can still be friends with Saudi Arabia and sell it \$109.5 billion worth of arms rather than \$110 billion worth of arms. The specific set of arms that we are talking about—precision-guided munitions that are going to be used to perpetuate the Saudi bombing campaign in Yemen—was the specific set of weapons that the Obama administration refused to transfer to the Saudis at the end of 2016. We did not take a vote on this in 2016. We took a vote on a different arms sale.

It is not simply that there is a new President and that Democrats are objecting to the arms sale that President Trump is moving forward with. It is that we have a new policy. This specific set of munitions that President Trump is asking us to consent to is one that President Obama would not sell. The policy is different, not just the personnel. Let's talk about why the policy is different.

What is happening today in Yemen is a humanitarian catastrophe of epic proportions. There are four famines that exist in the world today. One of them is in Yemen, and only one of those four is caused, in part, by the United States. The United States supports the Saudi-led bombing campaign that has had the effect of causing a humanitarian nightmare to play out in that country such that 8 million people right now in Yemen are in starvation or are on the brink of starvation. Last week, we received word that 100,000 people in Yemen now have cholera. Cholera? All of this is directly a result of the civil war.

The reason that the Obama administration decided not to transfer the precision-guided munitions to the Saudis is that the Saudis were using the weap-

ons we were giving them in order to deliberately target humanitarian infrastructure and civilian infrastructure inside Yemen. The Saudis have made it pretty clear that time is on their side, that they can wait out the Yemeni population and drive it to the negotiating table. They suggest that this humanitarian catastrophe, ultimately, accrues to their benefit because it eventually will push the Houthis into supporting a better deal than they would have otherwise for the Saudis.

Let me give you some direct evidence of how this bombing campaign is leading to the humanitarian crisis.

This cholera outbreak, which has been covered in the news, began, in part, because the Saudi airstrikes were targeting water treatment facilities inside Sanaa. This is independent reporting from relief agencies that operate on the ground inside Yemen that tell us that the Saudi bombing campaign that has targeted civilian infrastructure—in this case, water treatment facilities—has led to the cholera outbreak.

It continues. The bombing campaign that is leading to this catastrophe continues. The reason the Obama administration would not sell them this specific set of arms is that it did not have confidence that the arms would be used to hit purely military targets.

What we are asking for is to hold off on selling these precision-guided munitions until we get some clear promise—some clear assurance—from the Saudis that they are going to use these munitions only for military purposes and that they are going to start taking steps—real steps, tangible steps—to address the humanitarian crisis.

Senator YOUNG has been very articulate on the things that the Saudis are doing to stop—to halt—to slow the flow of relief supplies into Yemen today. There are some proactive things the Saudis could do, which they are not, that could save millions of lives inside Yemen today.

More broadly, I think this is an important moment for U.S. policy in the Middle East. The Saudis are our friends. They are an important, stabilizing presence in the Middle East. They have helped to broker a kind of detente between Sunni nations and Israel, our sacred ally. They cooperate with us on counterterrorism measures. They share intelligence with us. Clearly, we have an important economic relationship, but they are an imperfect partner.

This body should have a debate as to whether it is in the national security interests of the United States to get drawn more deeply into the set of proxy wars that is playing out in the region between the Sunnis and the Shia. That proxy battle plays out in Yemen; it plays out in Syria; and it plays out in other ways in places like Lebanon. Just because you have a friend does not mean that you have to back every single one of your friend's fights. If my friend asks me to hand him a rock to throw at the neighbor-

hood kids, I am not going to do it, but if he wants me to help him stand up to the neighborhood bully, then maybe I will be there for him. Even with your friends you decide what fights you join them in and what fights you don't.

In Yemen, it is not just I who is making the argument that the civil war is accruing to the detriment of U.S. national security interests; it is a broad swath of foreign policy experts and Middle East experts in this city and across this country and across the globe. Why? It is that this civil war is radicalizing the Yemeni people against the United States. They do not perceive this bombing campaign that is killing thousands of civilians as a Saudi bombing campaign. They perceive it as a U.S.-Saudi bombing campaign.

Just get your intelligence briefing, and look at the difference in the amount of space that AQAP controls today versus what it controlled before the civil war began. AQAP, which is the arm of al-Qaida that has the most capability to hit the United States, has grown exponentially in terms of the territory it controls. ISIS has grown as well. These extremist groups take advantage of the civil war, and if our priority in the region is really about defeating these organizations, then this civil war is not helping in that effort. Civilians are dying; extremist groups are growing; and the Yemeni population is being radicalized against us.

To exacerbate matters, the Trump administration has walked away from the political process. Secretary Kerry was actively involved in trying to bring the Houthis and the Saudi-backed government together. He got close to an agreement, but it fell apart. This administration has not restarted that process. For those who want to throw more arms into this contest, I think it is hard to believe that, ultimately, it will lead to any cease-fire or any peaceful transition to a new government if the United States is totally absent from the negotiating table as we are today.

This is not about objecting to the entirety of the sale, and this is not about delivering a broader message to the Saudis. This is about saying that this specific conflict in Yemen is not going well and is hurting the United States. Until we get some real assurances from the Saudis that they are going to pay attention to the "no strike" list, until we get some commitments from the Saudis that they are going to let relief supplies flow into Yemen to address the famine and address the cholera outbreak, then let's press pause on this small slice of this arms sale.

I am proud to join with Senator PAUL and others, and I hope that my colleagues will see fit to support it when we vote in about an hour and a half.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, before we recess for the caucus lunches, I wish to comment on the upcoming vote on a resolution of disapproval regarding a portion of President Trump's recent arms sales to Saudi Arabia. I have announced that I am in favor of the resolution of disapproval for several reasons.

First, the human rights and humanitarian concerns have been well documented with respect to Yemen. Yemen's story in the Middle East is a tragic one. Yemen's previous President ruled the country for decades with an iron fist and fleeced the country of its resources for his personal gain. He also allowed terrorist groups to enjoy safe haven in Yemen in the days after 9/11.

Today, Yemen remains a country in dire straits. It is on the verge of a famine, and there have been over 100,000 cases of cholera.

To make matters worse, the current conflict in Yemen, which includes the Saudi military, has worsened the humanitarian situation. Selling the kingdom precision weapons in this deal could further exacerbate the crisis.

Second, and of equal concern to me, is an area that hasn't been talked about much in this debate; that is, that the Saudi Government continues to aid and abet terrorism via its support and funding of schools that spread extremist Wahhabi propaganda. Saudi Arabia's support for these Wahhabi madrassas goes back decades. It is responsible for much of the radicalization of Muslim youth in the Middle East and North Africa.

In the past several months, we have witnessed lone-wolf attacks in London and in Tehran and elsewhere around the globe. Though the nature of terrorism has changed, many of the sources are the same. The propagation of Wahhabism, an extreme ideology, continues to fuel radicalism and terrorism around the globe. So if we want to get serious about cracking down on terrorism, the United States should focus—one of the focuses should be—on countering the spread of Wahhabism.

The White House has not clearly articulated how the United States will put pressure on Saudi Arabia to end their support of Wahhabi schools, even as it claims that President Trump's recent visit to Riyadh was focused on curtailing terrorism. Furthermore, the administration has not sufficiently assured Congress that these weapons will not fall into the wrong hands.

Look at Pakistan. It has become a radical place—it wasn't 15 years ago—in good part because of Saudi funding—Saudi individuals who are a good part of the government, some who are friends with the government—of these madrassas, which taught radicalism to the Pakistani people.

Look at Indonesia, one of the largest countries in the world. It had usually

practiced a form of Islam that was mild and tolerant. The Wahhabi schools are now flourishing in Indonesia, and it is becoming a radical place of danger to us.

We have to send a message to Saudi Arabia.

They do some good things. I support their putting pressure, for instance, on the Palestinian Authority to finally make peace with Israel. But they do a lot of bad things. It seems there has almost been a rotten deal between the Saudi monarchy and the Wahhabi clerics to work together. It has to end.

My vote for this resolution of disapproval hopefully can send a message to the Saudis that their behavior in regard to Wahhabism must change. It is hurting the world and eventually will hurt them.

I yield the floor.

#### RECESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands in recess until 2:15 p.m.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 12:33 p.m., recessed until 2:15 p.m. and reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. STRANGE).

#### MOTION TO DISCHARGE—S.J. RES. 42—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will now be 10 minutes of debate remaining on the motion to discharge S.J. Res. 42, equally divided between Senator PAUL or his designee and the opponents of the motion.

Who yields time?

The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I rise to speak in opposition to the resolution before us.

It has obviously been tried before, and I think there is no doubt that if it were to pass, this could pose a very dangerous threat to our relationship with Saudi Arabia at a time when the Iranians have now achieved a peninsula all the way across from Tehran all the way to Baghdad, and there is no doubt that the Iranians have continued their aggressive behavior.

If we vote down this arms sale to Saudi Arabia, it would have a devastating effect on our standing in the Middle East and a long-term impact on our ability to counter what is clearly Iranian aggressive behavior. So I strongly urge my colleagues to vote against this resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. President, I wish to join with Senator MCCAIN very quickly.

At 71 to 27, on September 21 of last year, we voted to approve tank sales to Saudi Arabia because they need more weapons and equipment to counter the Iranian aggression in Yemen and other places.

Most of the people who are now going to vote against precision-guided weap-

ons that will reduce civilian casualties voted for tank sales. This \$500 million carved out of this package gives Saudi Arabia a qualitative edge on the battlefield against Iranian proxies who could care less about civilian casualties. It is the most upside-down thinking I have ever seen, and many of you over there actually approved this because it was worked on before President Trump became President. So it is really disheartening to see you support President Obama's tank sales but that you are not going to support President Trump's selling weapons, which gives us an advantage over Iran in Saudi Arabia and actually reduces civilian casualties.

Secretary Mattis said it the best: Iran would appreciate killing this deal and taking these weapons off the table. I urge everybody in here, if you are serious about standing up to Iran, stand with Saudi Arabia, as imperfect as they are.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. President, the question is, Should we sell arms to Saudi Arabia—a country that many suspect was involved in 9/11; a country that many suspect gave weapons to ISIS, the people we are fighting in the Middle East; a country that imprisons the victims of rape because it is apparently or presumably the fault of the woman who is raped in Saudi Arabia?

One woman, the girl of Qatif, was given a sentence of 70 lashes and 6 months in jail. They increased her penalty to 200 lashes, and finally, only when we protested, was it reversed.

They sentenced a poet to 1,000 lashes. Sometimes you don't survive 1,000 lashes. So they gave him 100 at a time. He is going to be imprisoned for 10 years.

They are not the kind of persons we should be sending your weapons to. These weapons were funded and supported by the American taxpayer, and we should not be willy-nilly giving them to people who imprison their people for protesting.

Currently, a young man, 17 years old, named Ali al-Nimr is on death row. But it is not enough just to kill him for protesting for free speech and free press. They will behead him and crucify him.

This barbaric nation should not be getting our weapons. We should not sell them weapons.

Currently, there is a blockade of Yemen, and 17 million people risk starvation. We should not be supporting this effort.

There is probably no greater purveyor of hatred for Christianity and Judaism than Saudi Arabia. We should not be giving them weapons. They have madrassas across the world teaching hatred of us, preaching hatred of the West, hatred of Christianity, hatred of Judaism, and these people want to give them weapons. I don't get it. It makes no sense.

Some will argue that it is a jobs program. Well, isn't that swell. We are